



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,083	07/31/2001	Marcos Della	CSTO-00101	4446

7590

01/04/2006

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER

BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,083

Applicant(s)

DELLA, MARCOS

Examiner

Alicia Baturay

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 14 and 21-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-13 and 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 14 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 14, and 21-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 2, the term “fire wall” is ordinarily written as a single word. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grunnér (U.S. 6,199,165).
5. With respect to claim 1, Grunnér teaches a web server architecture comprising a web interface for providing a plurality of data transmission paths to the web, where at least one of the plurality of data transmission paths is an unrestricted data transmission path (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 25-27) and where at least one of the plurality of transmission paths is a restricted data transmission path (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 27-30).

6. With respect to claim 3, Grunnér teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the web server architecture where the web server interface discriminates sensitive data and routes the data to the restricted data transmission path (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 56-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 14, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grunnér and further in view of Miller et al. (U.S. 6,192,410).

Grunnér teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a user system that recognizes data as being either secure or general (non-secure). The user system transmits the secure data from an ISDN circuit on the D-channel, and the general data on the B-channel. A frame handler in the digital exchange recognizes the secure data in the D-channel and routes it via a physically separate telecommunications link to the service provider (see Abstract).

9. With respect to claim 2, Grunnér teaches the invention described in claim 1, including the web server architecture with a restricted data transmission path (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 27-30).

Grunnér does not explicitly teach the use of a firewall.

However, Miller teaches a restricted data transmission path comprising a firewall device for preventing the transmission of unauthorized data (Miller, col. 7, line 53 – col. 8, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grunnér in view of Miller in order to enable the use of a firewall. One would be motivated to do so in order to prevent unauthorized outsiders from accessing sensitive information within computing enterprises.

10. With respect to claim 14, Grunnér teaches a method of efficient transmitting data between the web and a web server network having a plurality of web servers, the method comprising the steps:

Discerning sensitive and non-sensitive data (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 56-58); routing non-sensitive data through a non-restricted pathway between the web and the web server network; and routing sensitive data through pathway between the web and the web server network (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 59-63).

Grunnér does not explicitly teach the use of a firewall.

However, Miller teaches the restricted pathway comprising a firewall device (Miller, col. 7, line 53 – col. 8, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grunnér in view of Miller in order to enable the use of a firewall. One would be motivated to do so in order to prevent unauthorized outsiders from accessing sensitive information within computing enterprises.

11. With respect to claim 21, Grunnér teaches the invention described in claim 14, including the method further comprising connection means for connecting the system to the web comprises a plurality of data transmission pathways for transmitting data between the system and the web (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 59-63).

12. With respect to claim 22, Grunnér teaches the invention described in claim 21, including the method further comprising connection means for connecting the system to the web comprises a plurality of data transmission pathways for transmitting data between the system and the web (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 59-63).

Grunnér does not explicitly teach the use of a firewall.

However, Miller teaches where one of the transmission pathways comprises a firewall (Miller, col. 7, line 53 – col. 8, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grunnér in view of Miller in order to enable the use of a firewall. One would be motivated to do so in order to prevent unauthorized outsiders from accessing sensitive information within computing enterprises.

13. With respect to claim 23, Grunnér teaches the invention described in claim 21, including the method discriminating sensitive data (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 56-58) and routing the sensitive data to the transmission pathways (Grunnér, col. 3, lines 59-63)

Grunnér does not explicitly teach the use of a firewall.

However, Miller teaches routing the sensitive data to the transmission pathways comprising the firewall (Miller, col. 7, line 53 – col. 8, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grunnér in view of Miller in order to enable the use of a firewall. One would be motivated to do so in order to prevent unauthorized outsiders from accessing sensitive information within computing enterprises.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Baturay
December 28, 2005


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER